Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

title or property which the dealer has *must be conferred on him by some words or act of the true owner.* In other words the true owner must do something so as to be estopped. *Pickering* v. *Busk,* 15 East. 38; *Smith* v. *Clews,* 105 N. Y. 283; see also *McNeil* v. *Tenth National,* supra; *Commercial Bank* v. *Kortright,* 22 Wend. 348; *Wood's Appeal,* 92 Pa. St. 379; *Calais Steamboat Co.* v. *Van Pelt,* 2 Black (67 U. S.) 372; *Nixon* v. *Brown,* 57 N. H. 34.

SALES—STOPPAGE IN TRANSITU.—Claimant sold goods to X, who later became insolvent. Under the terms of the sale, the vendor sent the goods to a bleachery for and on account of the vendee. The bleachery received the goods as the goods of the vendee, so entered them upon the books, bleached and finished the goods according to the directions of the vendee, held them subject to vendee's orders and shipped out some of the goods upon the vendee's order. The goods were bleached at the cost of vendee. *Held,* this was not such a delivery to vendee as to prevent the right to stop in transitu. *In Re Poe Mfg. Co.* (S. C. 1913), 80 S. E. 194.

This case makes an extreme construction in favor of the right of stoppage in transitu. Relying among among other cases on *Harris* v. *Pratt,* 17 N. Y. 249 and *Callahan* v. *Babcock,* 21 O. St. 281, the court said "It is not material whether the person in whose possession the goods are when the seller interposes his claim, be a carrier, a warehouseman, a wharfinger, packet or other depository or an agent for forwarding purposes, nor by which of the parties to the sale he was employed." This no doubt is true, when it is applied to a *forwarding* agent—and upon examination of the authorities upon which the principal case is founded it will be found that the place of stoppage was a steamboat, depot or warehouse connected with and ordinarily employed in the *forwarding* business—*Atkins* v. *Colby,* 20 N. H. 154; *Callahan* v. *Babcock,* 21 O. St. 281; *Mohr* v. *Boston Ry. Co.,* 106 Mass. 67. The true test to be applied is "Has the person who has custody of the goods, got possession as agent *to forward* from the vendor to the buyer, or as agent *to hold* for the buyer?" BENJAMIN, SALES, § 846; *Leeds* v. *Wright,* 3 B. & P. 320; *Scott* v. *Pettit,* 3 B. & P. 469; *Hoover* v. *Tibbits,* 13 Wis. 79. Applying this test to the principal case, the decision is clearly erroneous.

WILLS—CONSTRUCTION—DISTRIBUTION PER STIRPES OR PER CAPITA.—One item of the will in question was as follows: "I will and devise that at the death of my wife all of my said real estate shall be divided, share and share alike, between the nearest blood relation I may have living at that time and the nearest blood relation of my wife at the time of her death." This action is between the testator's sister and brothers, appellants, who contend that the distribution under the will should be per capita, and the widow's father, appellee, who contends that the distribution should be per stirpes. *Held,* that the distribution should be per stirpes. *Laisure* v. *Richards* (Ind. App. 1913), 103 N. E. 679.

The appellants in this case, attaching importance to the use of the words "share and share alike," insisted that the testator intended a per capita distribution among one class only, viz.,—"nearest relation both by blood and by